



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,702	08/30/2000	Brian A. Vaartstra	150.00800102	2471

26813 7590 03/20/2003

MUETING, RAASCH & GEBHARDT, P.A.
P.O. BOX 581415
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55458

EXAMINER

BARRECA, NICOLE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1756

DATE MAILED: 03/20/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/651,702

Applicant(s)

VAARTSTRA, BRIAN A.

Examiner

Nicole M. Barreca

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-25,27-29,31,32 and 43-48 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-25,27-29,31,32 and 43-48 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 17.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 19-25, 27-29, 31, 32, 43-48 are pending in this application.
2. The finality of the Office action mailed 9/18/02 is withdrawn.
3. The 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of claims 25, 27, 28, 31, 32, 43, 44, 47 and 48 has been withdrawn in response to the applicant's amendment filed 12/18/02. The 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 29 has been withdrawn in response to the applicant's amendment filed 2/11/03. The 35 USC 103 rejection of all the claims over Jackson in view of Gupta has been withdrawn because Jackson does not teach or suggest that the additive to the dense phase carbon dioxide gas is required ever to be in the supercritical state (see example 4 where the additive remains a liquid during the cycling) or that this additive may be sulfur trioxide in any state.

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is longer than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 19, 22 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gallagher (US 5,389,263).

Art Unit: 1756

7. Gallagher discloses a supercritical composition for the removal of organic materials, such as RDX (cyclotrimethylenetramine) and HMX (cylcotetramethylenetetranitriamine), from a liquid solution. Mixtures of crystalline organic materials such as RDX and HMX are separated using supercritical fluids as anti-solvents. The solid mixture containing at least two components to be separated are dissolved in a liquid solvent to form a solution and a supercritical anti-solvent is added to the solution in order to induce precipitation of one component (col.3, 39-65, col.7, 46-56). In one example the anti-solvent is sulfur trioxide (col.8, 56-57). The liquid solvent is any organic solvent or mixture of organic solvents (col.8, 58-60). See also col.9, 6-col.10, 39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 20, 21, 23-25, 27-29, 31, 32, 43-45, 47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher.

10. Gallagher does not explicitly disclose that the organic removal composition further includes, in addition to the sulfur trioxide, an oxidizer, such as nitrous oxide and/or additional components such as carbon dioxide or nitrogen. Gallagher however does teach that a second anti-solvent, different from the first anti-solvent may also be used (col.10, 36-39) and that additional examples of anti-solvents include nitrous oxide,

Art Unit: 1756

nitrogen and mixture thereof (col.8, 48-55). Carbon dioxide may also be used as the anti-solvent (col.8, 46-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an oxidizer, such as nitrous oxide and/or an additional component such as carbon dioxide or nitrogen to the supercritical organic removal composition comprising sulfur trioxide in the method of Gallagher because Gallagher teaches that a second anti-solvent, different from the first anti-solvent may also be used and that additional examples of anti-solvents include carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, nitrogen and mixtures thereof. Gallagher is silent on the amounts of anti-solvents used and does not disclose that the ratio of the first component to the total of the second component plus sulfur trioxide is about 1:100 by volume to about 100:1 by volume, or that the ratio of the carbon dioxide to sulfur trioxide is about 10:1 by volume to about 1:1 volume. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that varying the amount of anti-solvent used in the composition would affect the rate at which the precipitation or removal occurs and In re Boesch (617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215, CCPA 1980) establishes that it is unpatentable to discover optimum operating conditions or ranges of general conditions disclosed in the prior art. It is therefore within the ability of one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Gallagher to obtain the claimed volume ratios, a modification, which has been deemed unpatentable by the previously cited case law.


Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicole M. Barreca whose telephone number is 703-308-7968. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00 am-6:30 pm).


Art Unit: 1756

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 703-308-2464. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


nmb

March 18, 2003



MARK F. HUFF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700